

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are pending in the application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of the priority document in the previous Office Action dated 29 April 2003.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether or not the drawings, including the new formal drawing filed on 29 July 2003, are acceptable.

Claims 1, 9, and 11 have been amended, claim 6 has been cancelled, and new claims 14-17 have been added.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to claims 6-8. Claim 6 has been canceled and claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections are now moot.

35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Grupp et al. U.S. Patent 6,066,018 ("Grupp") in view of Greene et al. U.S. Patent 6,496,238 ("Greene").

Applicant respectfully traverses those rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Among other things, the active matrix device of claim 1 includes a non-rectangular array of control elements.

Neither Grupp nor Greene nor any combination thereof discloses or suggest

an active matrix device including such a feature.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the device of claim 1 is patentable over any combination of Grupp and Greene.

Claims 2-5 and 7-8

Claims 2-5 and 7-8 depend from claim 1 and are therefore deemed allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 9

Among other things, the liquid crystal display of claim 9 includes a non-rectangular array of control elements.

Neither Grupp nor Greene nor any combination thereof discloses or suggest a liquid crystal display including such a feature.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the device of claim 9 is patentable over any combination of Grupp and Greene.

Claim 10

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and are therefore deemed allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 9.

Claim 11

Among other things, the method of claim 11 includes shaping a pre-formed active matrix device, wherein the shaping results in the profile of both the array and the plate being non-rectangular.

Neither Grupp nor Greene nor any combination thereof discloses or suggest a method including such a feature.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the method of claim 11 is patentable over any combination of Grupp and Greene.

Claims 12 and 13

Although claims 12 and 13 are withdrawn from consideration at this time, Applicant understands that claims 12 and 13 will be added back in for consideration upon allowance of the linking claims 1 and 11. As explained above, Applicant respectfully submits that the linking claims 1 and 11 are now allowable. Accordingly, at this time, Applicant respectfully requests that the claims 12 and 13, dependent

from claim 11, be added back into the application

Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11 and are therefore deemed allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 11.

NEW CLAIMS 14-17

By this Amendment, Applicant has added new claims 14-17.

Claims 14-15 depend from claim 1, and claims 16-17 depend from claim 9, and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 9, respectively, and for the following additional reasons.

Among other things, in the active matrix device of claim 14, and the liquid crystal display of claim 16, the connectors and column address conductors converge from an edge of the array toward the row and column driver circuits over a fan-out area. Such a feature is shown, for example, in FIG. 3 and disclosed at page 5, lines 15-18. Meanwhile, in the active matrix device of claim 15, and the liquid crystal display of claim 17, the array has an oval shape. Such a feature is shown, for example, in FIG. 3 and disclosed at page 6, lines 10-11.

Applicant respectfully submits that an active matrix device including such features is not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1-23 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (703) 715-0870 to discuss these matters.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment (except for the issue fee) to Deposit Account No. 50-0238 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §

1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, P.L.L.C.

Date: 20 January 2004

By:



Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE FRANCOS, P.L.L.C.
12200 Sunrise Valley Drive, Suite 150
Reston, Virginia 20191
Telephone No.: (703) 715-0870
Facsimile No.: (703) 715-0877